

Trinity University Library

HX
11
.F25
no.185

NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Fabian Tract No. 185.

Trinity University Library

The Abolition of the Poor Law

By Mrs. Sidney Webb.

Price One Penny.

The Fabian Society, 25, Tothill Street,
Westminster, London, S.W.1. March, 1918.

HX 11 . F25 no. 135

THE ABOLITION OF THE POOR LAW.

For everything there is an appropriate time. There is a time to work and a time to play; a time to eat and a time to sleep. In the politics of the Labour Movement there is a time for speech and a time for action; a time for the declaration of our widest principles and purposes and a time for achieving particular reforms that are part of our programme. Now is the appointed time for securing one valuable and far-reaching improvement in our social organisation, which will put an end to much suffering and demoralisation, and open up the way to further emancipation. Now is the time when a determined effort by Trade Union Branches, Trades Councils, Co-operative Societies, the Women's Co-operative Guild, the Women's Labour League, Socialist organisations, and other progressive bodies from one end of England to the other would secure nothing less than the total and complete

ABOLITION OF THE POOR LAW.

This has been recommended by a strong Government Committee, in which the Labour Movement was represented by Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P. (National Union of Railwaymen), and myself. The Government is prepared to carry it promptly into law against all vested interests if the people declare themselves emphatically enough. The proposal is now submitted for the verdict of "public opinion."* It is the business of every section of the Labour Movement to express itself upon it promptly, loudly, and energetically. We can, if we like to take the trouble, at one blow, get rid not only of the Workhouse, the "Stone Yard," the Casual Ward, and the Board of Guardians, but also of the demoralising Poor Law itself, and of the very idea of "pauperism."

WHAT THE POOR LAW IS.

The English Poor Law, which dates from 1601, was in its time a notable expression of the right of the individual in distress to be helped by the community, and of the duty of the community to rescue from want even the weakest of its members. But the Poor Law and its administration became subject to grave abuses, which were drastically cut down in 1834. Unfortunately the system then adopted was one of limiting the public assistance to the "relief of destitution"; of refusing to help until "destitution" had set in; and of a rigid "deterrence" of all applications for relief by (a) making "pauperism" a disgrace; (b) treating applicants harshly and discourteously; (c) surrounding the relief by deliberately unpleasant conditions, such as "the offer of the Workhouse" and the imposition of penal tasks like picking oakum or "the Stone

* See the significant note by the Minister of Reconstruction prefixed to the Report of the Local Government Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction on the Transfer of the Functions of the Boards of Guardians (Cd. 8917), which will be sent on application to the Fabian Bookshop, 25, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.1, enclosing 3½d. in stamps.

Yard." The result has been that the Poor Law is universally hated. The Workhouse, even when humanely managed, is looked on with detestation. The degrading treatment of homeless wayfarers in the Casual Ward is furiously resented by all honest travellers. The unemployed have repeatedly refused to be relegated to the tender mercies of the Boards of Guardians. Men sometimes go to prison rather than seek Poor Law relief. Every year a few starve to death rather than accept the Poor Law Guardians' bitter bread. Yet in many a rural district there is no other shelter for the homeless, no other place for the sick, no other maternity hospital, no other refuge for the orphans, and no other asylum for the feeble-minded, no other home for the helpless aged than the General Mixed Workhouse in which they are all interned.

"CITIZENS, NOT PAUPERS."

Meanwhile there has been growing up, especially under the Town Councils of the most progressive great cities, another system of meeting our needs, not as paupers, eating the bread of charity, but as citizens, supplying ourselves collectively with what would be beyond our reach as individuals. Through the Local Education Authority we provide for our children, not only schools and teachers, but also books for them to read—if they are ailing, also medical treatment—if they are hungry, even food. Through the Local Health Authority we provide hospitals for such of us as are ill, and help in maternity and infancy, not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of the public health, in which all citizens, rich or poor, are equally concerned. Through the Old Age Pensions Committee we issue pensions (as yet far too small in amount, and beginning too late) to such of us over seventy as are in need of them, as a matter not of favour but of legal right. In all these and many other municipal services there is no "stigma of pauperism," and nothing disgraceful. When we need this help we are dealt with, not as paupers, but as citizens. And whilst the Town Council administration is very far from perfect, this is found to be much the most successful way of dealing with the cases. The municipal hospitals, the municipal schools, the municipal arrangements for maternity and infancy have been proved to be far and away more successful in preventing disease and death, and illiteracy, than the rival Poor Law institutions—not because the Poor Law institutions are always badly managed, but because they have to be run, even by the kindest and most efficient Board of Guardians, under the cramping and demoralising Poor Law, and subject to the minutely restrictive regulations of the Poor Law Division of the Local Government Board.

WASTE OF MONEY.

Another result is, in most of the populous cities, a terrible waste of public money in the duplication of institutions and overlapping of services. The Boards of Guardians provide everywhere, in one way or another, for maternity and infancy, for children needing schooling, for the sick and infirm, for the feeble-minded and lunatics, for the aged, and for the able-bodied unemployed—provided that these come under the definition of "destitute." The Town Council has its own arrangements for helping the mothers

and infants irrespective of destitution, runs its own set of schools, has its own doctors and nurses, administers its own hospitals, sanatoria and asylums, issues pensions to the aged, and even (through the Distress Committee) provides for the able-bodied unemployed. This double set of services and institutions for the same classes of people is wasteful and extravagant. It means an unnecessary multiplication of inquiries and officials. One or other—either the Poor Law system or the municipal system—must go. Which shall it be?

WHAT THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS.

The "Local Government Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction" proposes that—

(a) The entire Poor Law, with all the Orders of the Poor Law Division of the Local Government Board, the whole system of "deterrence," and all "taint of pauperism" should come to an end;

(b) The Workhouse, the "Stone Yard," and the "Casual Ward" should be abolished; and

(c) The Boards of Guardians should cease to exist.

It is proposed that all the buildings and other property of the Poor Law Authorities should be handed over (with proper adjustments for differences of area and for debts) to the directly elected Town and County Councils, to be made use of for the services already administered by their Education, Health, Asylums, and other Committees, in whatever way these Councils find most convenient.

All the present officers of the Poor Law Authorities would either be offered situations at least equivalent in value to those they now hold, or else be liberally compensated for loss of office or for any diminution of emoluments of all kinds.

The Poor Rate would no longer be levied.

Thus the whole Poor Law system would be wound up and finally got rid of.

But we must take care that all the people now dealt with under the Poor Law are provided for, without disturbance or the break of a single day, not only as well as they now are, but better; and that their legal right to maintenance is preserved.

Let us first consider the case of the County Boroughs, the eighty-two large towns like Manchester and Birmingham, which are now wholly governed by their directly elected Town Councils.*

THE SICK AND INFIRM.

It would be the duty of the Town Council, acting through its Health Committee, to take under its care, and to provide for under the Public Health Acts, along with those whom it already looks after, all the sick and infirm persons (including maternity and infancy and the aged needing institutional care) whom the Board of Guardians now provides for. The Health Committee would enlarge its present staff of doctors, nurses, and health visitors under its chief medical officer; and would increase its institutional accommodation (probably by using for this purpose some of the buildings

*The complications presented by London and the other Administrative Counties are explained on a later page.

transferred to the Council), so as to be able to merge among its existing patients, without any distinction according to poverty or riches, all the various classes of sick and infirm persons now in the Poor Law institutions. The Health Committee need not interfere with any voluntary hospitals already existing in the town, although it would probably wish to enter into mutually advantageous arrangements with these hospitals for particular cases or classes of cases. Nor is it suggested for the moment that there need be any change in the work of the Local Insurance Committee or in that of the doctors on the panel. Any reform of the Insurance Act must be left to the future.

THE CHILDREN OF SCHOOL AGE.

It would be the duty of the Town Council, acting through its Education Committee, to make, under the Education Acts, all provision required for the children now under the Poor Law who are able to attend school. Already most of these boys and girls attend the Council's schools; but some of them are in residential (Poor Law) schools or "Cottage Homes," and where these exist they would be transferred, subject to proper adjustments for difference of area, to the Council, and become part of its ordinary educational machinery, available without distinction for all orphans and other children needing board and lodging as well as schooling. Other "pauper" children are now in "Scattered Homes," which would equally pass to the Council. Others are "boarded out," and would likewise be henceforth arranged for by the Council. No child would henceforth be a pauper.

THE PERSONS OF UNSOUND MIND:

It would be the duty of the Council, acting through its Asylums Committee (together with its Mental Deficiency Committee, if this exists separately), to make all the necessary provision for persons of unsound mind, including idiots and the feeble-minded, whether or not they are formally "certified" under the Lunacy or Mental Deficiency Acts (though without any power of compulsorily detaining those not so "certified"). The Asylums Committee would, therefore have to increase its institutional accommodation—not necessarily on the present expensive scale of regular lunatic asylums—so as to provide proper homes and treatment for the feeble-minded and mentally deficient folk now herded together in the General Mixed Workhouses. Some of the Poor Law buildings to be transferred to the Councils could doubtless be adapted to this purpose. All persons of unsound mind would be freed from the "stigma of pauperism," and would be properly treated without distinction of class in respect of their unfortunate mental infirmity, and not in respect of their poverty.

THE UNEMPLOYED.

Under the Poor Law there is nothing for the able-bodied man who seeks in vain for employment, except what is really imprisonment in the Workhouse—it may be, under worse than prison conditions, in an "Able-bodied Test Workhouse." If the labourer tramps away in search of work he finds shelter only under degrading conditions in the Casual Ward. Only in extreme distress will the Poor Law Authorities provide employment outside the Work-

house, and then only at stone-breaking or other valueless labour, not at wages, but on a starvation pittance. So futile and disgraceful is the Poor Law system with regard to the able-bodied that even the Conservative Government of 1905 had to abandon it, and by the Unemployed Workmen Act to set up Distress Committees (and in London the Central Unemployed Body), working in conjunction with the Borough Councils. But these Distress Committees, which organise "relief works" and "farm colonies," are cramped in their powers. They are empowered neither to prevent the occurrence of unemployment by regularising the total demand for labour, nor yet find situations at wages for the unemployed, nor yet to provide "maintenance under training" for the unemployed, nor yet, frankly, to admit the demand of the Labour Party's "Right to Work" Bill.

What is now proposed by the Government Committee is that the whole business of dealing with the unemployment problem in each town should be placed, with new statutory powers, in the hands of the Town Council, which will be required to appoint a "Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee," *on which "Organised Labour" is to have a special right to be represented.* This committee will be expressly empowered to prevent the occurrence of Unemployment by keeping the total demand for labour in the town as far as practicable at a uniform level; to find situations for men and women; to provide maintenance and training for any who are unemployed; to provide village settlements if required; to assist towards migration or emigration of families wishing to move elsewhere; and generally to do whatever can be done to deal satisfactorily with the difficulty. As the Workhouse, the Casual Ward, and the "Stone Yard" will have come to an end with the Poor Law itself, there can be no reversion to these barbarisms.

This is a most important reform. One of its most important features is the right to be conceded to "Organised Labour" to be specially represented on the committee. The Trades Council and the Trade Union Branches must see to it that this representation is effectively given, as, by explicit order of the Government, it has been given on the Local War Pensions Committees, by the Trades Council (where it is fully representative) or the principal Trade Union Branches in the locality *being allowed to nominate their own representatives.** Where this is not done, and the Town Council chooses what it considers to be "representatives of Labour" (as happened by a blunder of the Ministry of Food in the Food Control Committees), the result is nearly always failure. The Trade Unions must insist, therefore, on Labour having the right to nominate its own representatives on the "Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee," as the Government intends and desires that it should do.

HOME ASSISTANCE.

There remains the large class of persons in need, for whom the best form of help is a weekly payment to "maintain the home." The widows with young children, the old people who can get

* See Report of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, Bristol, 1916.

decently looked after, the men and women crippled by chronic disease, the workers left temporarily without resources through some misfortune—how harshly and cruelly they have often been treated by the Poor Law Guardians, sometimes by the direct instigation of the Poor Law Division of the Local Government Board, in pursuance of the policy of always “offering the Workhouse” and trying to prohibit all Outdoor Relief.

This is now to come to an end. The Poor Law Orders, including the Outrelief Regulation Order, will drop. There will be no question of Poor Relief. There will be no Workhouse with which to threaten the applicants. The Town Council is to appoint its own committee, the “Home Assistance Committee,” which is, under new statutory powers, to be responsible for granting “Mothers’ Pensions” to widows, under the name of “home assistance,” for all cases which can best be helped in this way. This committee is to seek admission to suitable hospitals for those who are sick and who need to go to hospital; to procure admission to appropriate boarding schools for orphan and other children requiring this; to see that the old people, and the chronically afflicted, and the feeble-minded are properly cared for; to become the guardian of orphan and deserted children; and to look after the interests of all the families who come to it for help. This “Home Assistance Committee” is to be concerned only with “maintaining the home,” and—this is very important—is specifically not to have any institution of its own which it might be tempted to use as an alternative!

THE COUNTY COUNCIL.

In this way all the people now looked after by the Boards of Guardians under the Poor Law as paupers would henceforth be looked after as citizens by the Town Council itself through its several committees.

The same system would come into force in the administrative counties, with some necessary adjustments. In London, for instance, it is proposed that all the Poor Law buildings should pass to the London County Council, and that all necessary institutions for the sick and infirm, the persons of unsound mind, and the orphan and deserted children should be maintained by that Council—the Metropolitan Asylums Board and the Central Unemployed Body ceasing to exist, as well as the Boards of Guardians— whilst the Metropolitan Borough Councils would take over, under their own Health Committees and their own medical officers of health, the present outdoor medical staffs of the Boards of Guardians, and set up their own “Home Assistance Committees” to grant “home assistance” and “maintain the home.” The London County Council would undertake by its “Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee” the whole responsibility for preventing the occurrence of Unemployment by keeping the total demand for labour in London as far as practicable regular from year to year and throughout each year; and for providing in the most suitable way for the unemployed. And, in order to equalise the burden as between rich districts and poor, it is proposed that two-thirds of all the expenditure of the Metropolitan Borough Councils under these heads should, under proper rules, be repaid by the London County Council. In this way the poor districts would no longer be crushed

by such heavy local rates, to the advantage of the richer districts.

In the Administrative Counties other than London much the same sort of arrangements are proposed. But all the places having 50,000 population which are not County Boroughs will, for this purpose, have the same complete independence as if they were County Boroughs. This meets the need of such places as Tottenham and Willesden and Rhondda. The children of school age will be provided for by the Local Education Authority, whatever it is. The persons of unsound mind will be dealt with by the Asylums Committee of the County Council. The County Council will set up "Prevention of Unemployment and Training" and "Home Assistance" Committees, and these, aided by District Committees in the different localities, on which the local councillors will sit, will look after all the cases. With regard to the provision to be made for the sick and infirm (including maternity and the aged requiring institutional care), it is suggested that the responsibility should be with the County Council, and that it should at once submit a scheme, showing how it proposes to make the necessary provision for all the various needs for all parts of the County. If any Borough or Urban District which is important enough to be a Local Education Authority very much desires to be independent as regards this new and enlarged Health service, and can show itself prepared to make proper provision without delay at the expense of its own rates, it is suggested that it might (under proper conditions of co-operation with the County scheme) be allowed to run its own hospitals and homes for the infirm aged, its own scheme of maternity and infancy care, and its own medical and nursing service. But no district is to be allowed to "contract out" in order to be free to neglect its duty.*

Such, in summarised form, is the plan for the breaking up of the Poor Law and the abolition of pauperism, which the Government is understood to be prepared to put before Parliament *if public opinion demands it*. Of its advantage to the poor, and also to the nation as a whole, it is unnecessary to speak. Three questions are asked about it.

CAN THE COUNCILS DO ALL THE WORK?

The answer is: Yes, easily, if the councillors set about it properly, and so organise their business that the elected representatives do the work of representatives, and do not attempt—a fault of many a councillor—to take upon themselves work which ought to be done by the salaried municipal officials, whom the elected representatives ought only to appoint, supervise, and direct. The existing Education, Health, and Asylums Committees will not find their work seriously increased merely because the numbers under their care have grown. But two new committees must be manned (the "Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee" and

* The various incidental functions of the Poor Law Authorities are, of course, to be provided for. The administration of the Vaccination Acts and of those relating to the Registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths will pass to the Local Health Authority. The appointment of the Assessment Committee, where this is now made by the Board of Guardians, will go to the County Council, pending a complete reform of assessment and rating.

the "Home Assistance Committee"); and there will be, under the other committees, additional institutions to be looked after by new sub-committees. The need for more men (and especially for more women, and for both men and women of experience in the special work to be done) must be faced. The number of councillors cannot usually be increased with advantage or without making the Council itself too large for efficiency. There seems no alternative but to give the Council power to add to each committee a minority from outside the Council. This resort to unelected persons is sometimes thought to be against Democratic theory. But, after all, the Council itself has still the decision. The committee or the sub-committee can act only under the Council's orders. What is more important, this plan of Co-optation, within due limits, is found to work well. It has long been of great use in most large towns in the case of Libraries and Museums Committees. It was at first strongly objected to in the case of the Education Committee, but after fifteen years' trial very few Education Committees would now wish to abandon it. It would be of considerable value to have some representatives of the Local Insurance Committee on the Health Committee. The same thing would be of great assistance to the Asylums Committee, which has everywhere a most burdensome task, for which many of the councillors can with difficulty find time. And, in the case of the Prevention of Unemployment and Training Committee, *it becomes of very special value if it enables the Trades Council and the principal Trade Union Branches in the district to nominate their own representatives to this Committee.* If only for this reason alone, Organised Labour should think twice before it condemns the suggestion.

WILL IT RAISE THE RATES?

The reform ought to lower the rates, not raise them. The General Rate for the Town or County Council's expenditure will necessarily go up; but, on the other hand, *the Poor Rate will cease altogether.* There will have to be more spent in proper provision for the sick and on maternity and infant care; but, on the other hand, the present extravagant duplication of institutions and multiplication of officials will come to an end. Moreover, the Government has already agreed to propose to Parliament an extensive new Grant in Aid of all Health services, as well as increased Education Grants; and these ought to be sufficient at least to prevent any increase in the rates.

CAN SUCH A REFORM BE GOT THROUGH WHILST THE WAR LASTS?

It *must* be got through promptly, even whilst we are at war, because it is supremely important to put our social machinery in order before Peace is declared. The very day after Peace is assured the great industrial dislocation and "general post" of workers will begin. The munition workers will be suddenly and promptly dismissed. The millions of soldiers will be rapidly discharged to a labour market which will, at least, be disorganised. and may (owing to shortage of raw material) be calamitously over-

stocked. More than eight millions of men and women will lose their employment within a year or so. There will presently be hundreds of thousands of men and women seeking situations. And disease will increase. The close of a war has always been a time of increased sickness. Many thousands of "carriers" of disease from foreign countries will be scattered among the whole population. However optimistic we may be as to "Trade after the War," the nation cannot fail to have to face Unemployment, Disease, and Want in thousands of homes. We need to set our house in order before the time comes. "Do it now" rather than "Wait and See."

The Ministry of Health Bill is waiting. The Maternity and Infancy ("Baby-saving") Bill is overdue. Would it not be the right course—one overcoming many objections—to insert the necessary clauses abolishing the Poor Law in the same Bill as the other two reforms, and thus put through the whole reorganisation at once.

You are requested—

1. To get resolutions passed by every organisation with which you are connected asking the Government promptly to carry the Abolition of the Poor Law.
2. To get such resolutions sent to the Prime Minister and also to the member of Parliament for the constituency.
3. To get deputations sent to your member of Parliament asking for his help in the matter.
4. To make it a test question at any Parliamentary Election.
5. To get it brought forward for discussion in your Town or County Council.
6. To write a letter to the local newspaper urging the necessity for the Abolition of the Poor Law.

APPENDIX.

For further information see the following, any of which would be sent on receipt of remittance by the Fabian Bookshop, 25, Tothill Street, London, S.W.1:—

Report of Local Government Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction on the Transfer of the Functions of the Boards of Guardians (cd. 8917). Price 3½d., post free.

Poor Law Commission, 1905-9. Majority Report, 2 vols.; Minority Report, 1 vol. (The Minority Report, which was that of the Labour representatives on the Commission, contains a complete account of the Poor Law and the provision for the Unemployed, and remains still the best description of the whole system.)

English Poor Law Policy. By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. 6s. net (postage 5d.). A detailed analysis of the changes between 1834 and 1907.

The Prevention of Destitution. By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Price 7s. 6d. net (postage 6d.). A policy and programme for actually preventing extreme poverty.

ALL ABOUT THE I.L.P. :

Its Origin, Its Policy, Its Methods, Its Objects, Its Inspiration, Its Views on the War, Peace and the Settlement.

1d., post free 1½d.

THE NEW FRANCHISE ACT

Explained by PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P.

1d., post free 1½d.

SOCIALISM AFTER THE WAR

By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P.

1/-, post free 1/2; cloth, 2/6, post free 2/10.

THE MINSTRELSY OF PEACE

A collection of notable verse in the English tongue relating to Peace, ranging from the Fifteenth Century to the present day. Edited, with Notes and an Introduction on Poetry and War and Peace in English Poetry, by **J. BRUCE GLASIER.**

Cloth 5/- net, post free 5/5.

AFRICA AND THE PEACE OF EUROPE

A New Book by E. D. MOREL (Author of "Truth and the War," "Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy," &c.)

In this volume Mr. Morel brings his special knowledge to bear upon the African problem as it affects the Peace of Europe. The distribution of European sovereign rights in Africa, and the manner of their interpretation, are admittedly amongst the most difficult questions which the Peace Conference will be called upon to settle.

2/-, post free 2/4. Two maps.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY

By J. A. HOBSON.

Contents: How to Break the Vicious Circle. The New Economic Situation. Two Problems for Labour. The Conquest of the State. The Close State and Internationalism.

1/-, post free 1/2.

SOCIALISM FOR PACIFISTS

By A. FENNER BROCKWAY (Editor of the "Labour Leader").

Contents: The Militarist and Socialist Ideals. War and the Economic System. Capitalist Interests which thrive on War. Trade and Financial Rivalry as a cause of War. The Socialist Movement and Peace. Socialism and the Labour Movement. The I.L.P., The War, and Peace.

6d., post free 8d.

THE KEIR HARDIE CALENDAR

A quotation for every day in the year, compiled by **R. C. WALLHEAD.** 120 pp., printed in two colours, and containing a recent photograph of Hardie.

Paper covers 1/-; cloth covers 1/6; postage 4d.

JAMES KEIR HARDIE: A MEMORIAL

By J. BRUCE GLASIER.

100 pp., profusely illustrated. Paper covers 1/-; cloth covers 1/6; postage 4d.

"It will make those who are not of us understand Keir Hardie in his death as they never understood him in his life; and it will deepen our own determination."

Published by **THE NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, LTD.,**
30, Blackfriars Street, Manchester, and 8 and 9, Johnson's Court,
Fleet Street, London, E.C.4., and to be obtained at the Fabian Book Shop.

Printed by **ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD.,** Portugal Street, Strand, W.C.2.

Fabian Tract No. 232.

The Personnel of the British Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service, 1851-1929

BY

ROBERT T. NIGHTINGALE.

PUBLISHED AND SOLD BY
THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

LONDON :
THE FABIAN SOCIETY, 11, DARTMOUTH STREET, WESTMINSTER,
LONDON, S.W.1. PUBLISHED FEBRUARY, 1930.

The Personnel of the British Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service, 1851-1929.

ROBERT T. NIGHTINGALE.

I.

The connection between public opinion and public policy is slighter in foreign affairs than in any other sphere of politics. In normal times international relations have little palpable impact upon the life of the people. They are obscured by more vivid domestic issues until war or some sudden crisis throws a high light on their significance. Even since the Great War, although public realisation of the importance of foreign affairs has begun to be aroused in the late belligerent countries, in England at any rate, direct contact between popular opinion and Government action is still both sporadic and uncertain.

What is true of the British people as a whole is almost equally true of its representative assembly. Parliament has but little power over the conduct of foreign affairs. Some of the most momentous changes in the country's relations with other Powers have, in the present century, been accomplished without reference to the House of Commons, and often without even its knowledge. The people's representatives have no effective control over that department of public affairs which is at present of more vital concern than any other.

Most British Foreign Secretaries, indeed, regard their actions as matters of exclusively executive concern. A Cabinet of twenty Ministers, already overworked in their own departments, is not, however, a body which can conduct the country's foreign relations. The Foreign Secretary on his own subject dominates his Ministerial colleagues. Experience shows that he can avoid consultation with all the Cabinet save two or three of the principal Ministers. The Cabinet as a whole has an authority not much greater than that of Parliament in guiding foreign policy and even in controlling decisions which may pledge the nation to future hostilities.

Accordingly, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs is subjected to less criticism from people, Parliament and Cabinet, and enjoys a greater freedom from outside control than any other Minister. It does not follow, however, that he is in the position of an isolated autocrat possessing, as Bryce said, "all but unlimited discretion." Fifty years ago, a Foreign Secretary, if he were of the Palmerston type, could stamp his whole policy with the mark of his individuality. But to-day the ramifications of international affairs are such that no one man, even

if assisted as at present by two parliamentary under-secretaries, can exercise an adequate supervision over the whole field of international relations. Just as Parliament has delegated foreign affairs to the Cabinet, and the Cabinet to the Foreign Secretary, so the Foreign Secretary is compelled by the pressure of business to delegate an increasing proportion of his authority to his chief permanent officials. Personal administration on any considerable scale is impossible. The Foreign Secretary is responsible for the lines of policy adopted, but in their practical execution he is guided by the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service.

The ephemeral political amateur must necessarily be greatly dependent on the established administrative expert. In foreign affairs the dependence is accentuated, owing firstly to the growing congestion of business, and secondly to the fact that intercourse between nations is carried on largely by ambassadors and envoys stationed abroad in each capital. These diplomatic representatives possess the exact knowledge on which the Secretary of State's decisions must be based, and they are also his chief means of implementing the policies on which he decides. The number of British embassies and legations has increased from 22 in 1851 to 46 in 1929. The Foreign Secretary, oppressed by the accumulation of affairs and the growth of contacts with foreign Powers, is drawn away from outside influences and relies increasingly on his official advisers at home and abroad.

The dependence of the Foreign Secretary upon his bureaucratic subordinates means that the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service are departments of greater autonomy than any other section of the British Civil Service. An exceptionally great authority is wielded in foreign relations by the bureaucracy in comparison with the democracy. It is truer in international even than in domestic affairs that to discover the incidence and effects of State action it is necessary to examine not merely the legislature and the executive, but also the administrative machine by means of which principles are translated into practice. Day-to-day relations with foreign Powers are in the hands of accredited representatives enjoying virtual independence. And whereas in domestic administration the future can in a measure be foreseen and provided for, in foreign affairs passing incidents often prove subsequently to be crucial, and crises usually arise without warning. On such occasions much of the Foreign Secretary's authority perforce devolves upon his representatives on the spot. Moreover the actual conduct of international relations depends in the main on the interaction of personalities. Individuals count for more than institutions.

Enough has been said to show that the instrument through which foreign policy is conducted, and in practice to a large extent

created, is of foremost importance, and that accordingly the character of its personnel is worthy of the closest examination.

John Bright, speaking in 1858, described England's foreign policy as "neither more nor less than a gigantic system of outdoor relief for the aristocracy of Great Britain." What truth was there in the generalisation at that date? Has it become less true since then? If so, to what extent? To such questions and their implications a quantitative analysis of the kind that follows can alone provide satisfactory answers.

II.

A permanent, competitively selected administration was one of the greatest political inventions of the nineteenth century. The reform of the British Civil Service began in 1855. Until then the administrative machine had been manned by placemen who owed their positions to family and political influence. The growth of democratic ideas and the multiplication of the State's liabilities made the system of patronage intolerable. The remedy applied was the competitive examination, which gradually opened the Civil Service to members of the newly enfranchised middle classes.

The first breach in the aristocratic political régime was made by the Reform Act of 1832. But it was nearly a quarter of a century before any step was made towards democratisation of the Civil Service. Realisation that administrators, like governors, must, if they are to be good servants of the people, be drawn from the people, came slowly and reluctantly.

In the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service progress was much slower even than in the rest of the Civil Service. Until 1880 no limit beyond a "qualifying test" was set to the patronage of the Secretary of State in making appointments to the Diplomatic Service, and even the "limited competition" then instituted was not, to quote the report of the Macdonnell Commission of 1912-14, "calculated materially to raise the efficiency of the service or to widen the area from which candidates were drawn." Until 1919 no candidates could sit for the examination for either the Diplomatic Service or the Foreign Office unless they were "known to the Secretary of State or recommended to him by men of standing and position on whose judgment he could rely and who themselves knew the candidates personally." Even after nomination, candidates were not permitted to sit for the examination until they were approved of by a Board of Selection who were beyond question influenced by considerations of social eminence. Moreover, until after the Great War it was made a condition of nomination that candidates should possess a private income of not less than £400 a year.

The reason why the democratic principle has been extremely slow in permeating the methods of recruitment for the British Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service is to be found in the theory by which foreign affairs have been conducted. "There is," wrote Bagehot in the 1860's, "one kind of business in which our aristocracy have still, and are likely to retain long, a certain advantage. This is the business of diplomacy. . . . The old-world diplomacy of Europe was largely carried on in drawing-rooms, and, to a great extent, of necessity still is so." Diplomacy was thought to require a breeding and finesse that could be found only amongst the aristocracy and the gentry. It was a branch of public affairs in which suitable administrators could be secured only if the democracy continued to select them according to the aristocratic principle. To associate on equal terms with the Ministers of foreign Governments, a diplomatist should possess the elegance and refinement of manners which result from gentle birth and aristocratic upbringing. Thus, until 1919, the Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service remained as a relic of the régime which had first begun to crumble in 1832. It was almost a century after the first step had been taken towards democratisation of the State when the career of diplomacy was opened unconditionally to ability.

III.

Some explanation is due of the nomenclature and classification adopted in this study. The term "aristocratic" has been applied to all who hold hereditary titles. The category of "rentier" includes all others who possess independent means which exempt them from the necessity of working for a livelihood. The great majority of this class belongs to the landed gentry and to county families. When, as often occurs, a man is a rentier and also follows a profession, he has been classified under his calling. The number of rentiers therefore is in fact somewhat greater than the figures disclose. "The Professions" comprise the Church, the Law, the Army and Navy, and Medicine. "The Higher Civil Service" indicates the Foreign Office, the Diplomatic Service, the Consular Service, and the rest of the administrative Civil Service.

The numbers of those educated at Eton and Harrow are given separately. Other public schools are sub-divided into two sections. The "leading public schools" are for this purpose nine in number, Westminster, Rugby, Marlborough, Clifton, Winchester, Malvern, Cheltenham, Charterhouse, and Haileybury. Under "lesser public schools" all schools are included if they are to be found in the "Public Schools Yearbook," a list which comprises, after allowance for the schools already enumerated, some 140 places of education. Where a man has

been at more than one university, both are recorded. Education at universities abroad is noted, but many classified under the head "No University" have doubtless studied languages at foreign universities. It is to be observed that the calculations derived from the tables are subject to a certain margin of error, since it has been impossible to obtain complete statistics.

The ranks included in this inquiry are, in the Foreign Office, permanent, deputy, and assistant under-secretaries, chief clerks, counsellors, and assistant secretaries; and in the Diplomatic Service, ambassadors extraordinary and envoys extraordinary. In the period 1851 to 1929, 249 men held one or more of these posts, of whom 39 served in the Foreign Office alone, 192 in the Diplomatic Service alone, and 18 in both services. Table I. shows their parentage and the school and university they attended, and gives the same particulars for the Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service separately.

TABLE I.

(a) PARENTAL OCCUPATION.

	F.O.	D.S.	Total.
Aristocrats	17	82	93
Rentiers	6	36	39
Foreign Office	1	3	4
Diplomatic Service	4	10	12
Consular Service	1	5	6
Other Civil Service Departments	4	6	7
Church	2	11	13
Law	3	8	10
Army	5	19	24
Navy	1	3	3
Medicine	—	4	4
Parliament	4	3	6
Business	2	9	10
Literature	—	2	2
Academic	—	1	1
Stage	1	—	1
Unclassified	6	8	14
	<u>57</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>249</u>

(b) SCHOOL.

	F.O.	D.S.	Total.
Eton	27	67	85
Harrow	6	23	27
Leading Public Schools	6	36	38
Lesser Public Schools	4	22	26
Other Schools	—	9	9
Military and Naval Colleges	—	5	5
Privately	1	18	18
Abroad	2	9	10
Unclassified	11	21	31
	<u>57</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>249</u>

(c) UNIVERSITY.

	F.O.	D.S.	Total.
Oxford	15	62	72
Cambridge	9	31	36
London	—	2	2
Edinburgh	—	3	3
Glasgow	—	1	1
Dublin	—	5	5
Belfast	—	2	2
Foreign Universities	3	5	7
No University	24	100	115
Unclassified	7	5	12
	<hr/> 58 <hr/>	<hr/> 216 <hr/>	<hr/> 255 <hr/>

The above table provides a broad picture of the nature of the personnel of the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service during the last eighty years. The most striking deduction is that 53 per cent. belong to the aristocracy or the gentry. Twenty-two per cent. were sons of men following one or other of the professions, but only 4 per cent. came from business families. Among parents dependent on their own efforts for a livelihood, civil servants and soldiers form easily the largest categories. The extent of heredity is worthy of remark: 12 per cent. were sons of members of the Foreign Office or the Diplomatic Service, and if the Consular Service and the rest of the administrative Civil Service are included, the percentage is 17. Investigation shows that the tendency for sons to follow their fathers in a diplomatic career was more marked in the earlier part of the period. Rather surprisingly, among those included in this analysis, only six were the sons of politicians.

Attendance at one or other of the great English public schools is the hall-mark of a high social position. Sixty per cent. went to the eleven most exclusive schools. Of the remaining 40 per cent., well over one-half attended the lesser public schools, received a military or naval education, or were educated privately or abroad. Only nine men out of 249 have been traced who went to schools other than the recognised public schools and the military and naval colleges, and of these five were not diplomats *de carrière*. Forty-five per cent. of the personnel of the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service went to the two foremost schools in the country, and over one-third were Etonians.

The statistics of university education bear out the inferences already clear. Of those who received higher education 90 per cent. went to either Oxford or Cambridge. The remaining 10 per cent. are accounted for by three who went to Edinburgh and seven who went to Irish universities. Not a single man went exclusively to London University. By far the largest category in this column, however, consists of those who went to no university at all. It is significant that only about one

man in two of those occupying the selected posts in the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service was university-trained.

A comparison of the two services shows that the Diplomatic Service is the more socially exclusive. The aristocratic and rentier classes form 56 per cent. of the Diplomatic Service, but only 40 per cent. of the Foreign Office. This fact is probably due to the attraction to men of noble birth of service abroad in an environment of Courts and aristocratic society, and equally no doubt to the necessity until recently for ample private means to supplement the diplomatist's official salary. A perceptibly higher proportion of the Foreign Office personnel consists of public-school men, and indeed no member of the Foreign Office has been traced who has attended any school in this country other than the public schools. In contrast, 13 per cent. of diplomatists have been educated either privately or abroad. This is due to the important part which foreign languages play in diplomacy, and to the exacting linguistic tests imposed on entrants to the Diplomatic Service. It is notable that among men trained at British universities every member of the Foreign Office without exception went either to Oxford or Cambridge, while 6 per cent. of diplomatists went elsewhere.

Table II. shows the proportion of aristocrats at some of the principal British embassies and legations.

TABLE II.

Country.	Total Number of Diplomatic Representatives, 1851-1929.		Number of Aristocrats.	
France	...	9	...	8
U.S.A.	...	14	...	8
Germany	...	12	...	10
Belgium	...	10	...	8
Austria	...	16	...	12
Italy	...	13	...	6
Russia	...	15	...	11
Portugal	...	18	...	10
Greece	...	12	...	8
Netherlands	...	14	...	10
Sweden and Norway	...	20	...	10
		<u>153</u>		<u>101</u>

A majority of the ambassadors to the republican United States have been of aristocratic birth, and the French Republic has since 1851 received no ambassador, with the single exception of the present one, who has not been a member of the aristocracy. Furthermore, the proportion of aristocrats is distinctly higher in the more important than in the less important diplomatic posts. Over the whole period 35 out of the 66 ambassadors (or 53 per cent.) have been aristocratic in origin, but in the case of envoys the proportion is only 73 out of 194 (or 38 per cent.).

These figures lend colour to the theory that preference is shown to aristocrats in appointments to the highest-placed chancelleries.

The broad conclusion indicated by the statistics hitherto tabulated is that the British Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service are wholly unrepresentative of the general community whose accredited delegates they are. Their members are drawn to the extent of 37 per cent. from the aristocracy, which consists of no more than about one thousand families, and to the extent of 86 per cent. from the aristocratic, rentier, bureaucratic, and professional classes—classes which form a mere fraction of the total population.

IV.

It is important to discover whether, during the seventy-nine years under review, any change in the character of the personnel has taken place, and whether the reforms in the procedure of recruitment which have from time to time been effected, have enlarged the circle from which entrants are drawn.

Attention must be given mainly to the pre-war period, because, although far-reaching reforms in the examination system were carried out after the War, their effect during the last decade is as yet difficult to estimate. The system that the reforms of 1919 supplanted was recruitment by what has been called "limited competition." In the Foreign Office "limited competition" replaced patronage as early as 1857, but in the case of the Diplomatic Service there were two landmarks in the reform movement. In 1857 pure patronage was supplemented by a "qualifying test." No competitive element was, however, introduced into the test, and it was not until 1880 that "limited competition" was set up. Table III. gives particulars for 51 men who went into the Diplomatic Service during Period I., up to 1856, the period of undiluted patronage; 30 during Period II., 1857 to 1879, the period of the "qualifying test"; and 87 during Period III., 1880 and after, the period of "limited competition."

TABLE III.

(a) PARENTAL OCCUPATION.

					Period I.	Period II.	Period III.
Aristocrats	32	15	25
Rentiers	5	4	23
Higher Civil Service	5	3	12
Professions	3	7	19
Parliament	1	—	2
Business	—	1	4
Literature	1	—	—
Academic	—	—	1
Unclassified	4	—	1
					—	—	—
					51	30	87
					==	==	==

(b) SCHOOL.

	Period I.	Period II.	Period III.
Eton	15	7	38
Harrow	3	8	10
Leading Public Schools	7	5	18
Lesser Public Schools	2	5	5
Other Schools	2	—	2
Military Colleges	2	1	—
Privately	6	2	7
Abroad	3	—	3
Unclassified	11	2	4
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	51	30	87
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

(c) UNIVERSITY.

	Period I.	Period II.	Period III.
Oxford	8	13	34
Cambridge	8	1	15
Edinburgh	2	—	—
Dublin	3	2	—
Foreign Universities	2	1	2
No University	27	13	36
Unclassified	2	—	2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	52	30	89
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

The foregoing table is evidence of a well-defined movement towards democratisation in the Diplomatic Service. During the epoch of patronage two out of three diplomatists were aristocrats. After the reform of 1857 the proportion declined to one in two, and when competition was inserted in the examination in 1880, to less than one in three. The percentage of men whose fathers earned their own livelihood rose from 20 in the first to 37 in the second, and 44 in the third period. The proportion of sons of civil servants increases perceptibly after 1880, and the parental categories of professional and business men show a marked expansion over the whole period. The percentage educated at the eleven most exclusive public schools rises from 49 in the first to 67 in the second and 76 in the third period. The higher proportion of public-school men in recent years may be attributed to the fact that Roman Catholics, who have always been numerous in both the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service, were formerly debarred from going to English public schools, and were educated, as investigation bears out, either at Catholic schools in England or abroad, or privately at home. Since the abolition of patronage there has been a discernible increase in the proportion of academically trained men. Moreover, it is noteworthy that not a single diplomatist of distinction who has entered the service since 1880 has been trained at any university other than the two premier ones.

In the case of the Diplomatic Service and, to a less degree, the Foreign Office, there has been a constant influx of men who have not entered the services at the usual age or passed through the lower ranks. Table IV. gives particulars including their previous careers, for these outsiders, who number 47 in all, and form 20 per cent. of the personnel of the Diplomatic Service and 11 per cent. of the Foreign Office.

TABLE IV.

(a) PARENTAL OCCUPATION.				(c) UNIVERSITY.			
Aristocrats	10	Oxford	11
Rentiers	6	Cambridge	8
Higher Civil Service	5	London	2
Professions	17	Edinburgh	1
Business	5	Glasgow	1
Literature	1	Belfast	2
Unclassified	3	No University	24
			—	Unclassified	1
			47				—
			—				50
			—				—
(b) SCHOOL.				(d) PREVIOUS CAREER.			
Eton	9	Consular Service	25
Harrow	3	Higher Civil Service	5
Leading Public Schools	6	Politics	9
Lesser Public Schools	12	Army	1
Other Schools	5	Navy	1
Military and Naval Colleges	2	Royal Household	2
Privately	3	Law	2
Abroad	3	Journalism	2
Unclassified	4				—
			—				47
			47				—
			—				—

It is clear from the above table that this category is drawn from a lower social class than the remainder. The percentage whose fathers belonged to the leisured class is 34, in comparison with 57 for the rest of the personnel. The professions are here the largest category of parental occupations. Sixty-five per cent. of those who spent their lives in the Foreign Office or in diplomacy were at the more exclusive public schools, as contrasted with 38 per cent. among the laymen, and in the foregoing table public schools of the second rank form the largest scholastic class. Of the seven members of the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service who alone have exclusively attended any British university other than Oxford or Cambridge, it is notable that three have been men who entered the services after careers elsewhere. It is worthy of note also that the proportion of outsiders who have had an academic training is slightly below the general average for the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service.

A study of the previous careers of men under this head reveals the fact that a majority of them had served in the Consular

Service. Earlier a number of the twenty-five thus accounted for had been student interpreters, while others had passed through the Army and become military attachés before being drafted into the Consular Service. In some countries where a thorough knowledge of national traditions and customs is desirable, it has been a common practice to fill diplomatic vacancies from the junior service. Four out of ten diplomatic representatives in Japan, seven out of thirteen in China, three out of eight in Morocco, two out of four in Ethiopia, and all three in Costa Rica have been appointed to their embassies or legations without previous experience in the Diplomatic Service, and all of them have graduated through the Consular Service. Of the 47 men drafted into the Foreign Office or the Diplomatic Service from outside, all except four came from some career of State service or public life. It is noteworthy that 19 per cent. of them were drawn from politics and in recent years there is observable a growing disposition to award the highest posts to distinguished politicians. Of the four most recent ambassadors at Washington, two—Viscount Bryce and Sir Auckland Geddes—had been Ministers of the Crown.

Ambassadors and envoys promoted from below or from outside have frequently had diplomatic careers of unusual distinction. Sir Ernest Satow at Peking and Tokio, and Sir John Jordan at Tokio, both of whom were preferred from the Consular Service, were diplomatists of special prominence. Sir William White at Constantinople was one of the most celebrated of ambassadors. Two ex-politicians—Viscount Bryce in the United States and the Marquess of Dufferin in France—were outstanding diplomatic successes.

The Macdonnell Commission on the Civil Service of 1912-1914 made certain recommendations for the reform of the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service which were put into effect in 1919. The two services were amalgamated into a single "Foreign Service." While special proficiency was still required in foreign languages, the general examination scheme was assimilated to that for the rest of the administrative Civil Service. The conditions requiring a candidate, before he could proceed to the examination, to obtain a nomination from the Secretary of State himself or from someone "of standing and position," and also to possess a private income of at least £400 a year, were both abolished. Effect was given to the proposal that "the salaries and allowances in the Diplomatic Service should . . . make it possible for a member of that service to live upon his official emoluments."

It is a matter of great importance to discover whether the adoption of these reforms has had any marked influence on the

nature of the personnel recruited since 1919. Statistics are sparse, but the Reports of the Civil Service Commissioners 1923 to 1928 give the places of education of the 31 successful candidates during that period. These figures are set out below.

TABLE V.

(a) SCHOOL.					(b) UNIVERSITY.				
Eton	7	Oxford	19
Harrow	3	Cambridge	11
Leading Public Schools	10	London	1
Lesser Public Schools	9	No University	1
Other Schools	2					
				<hr/>					<hr/>
				31					32
				<hr/>					<hr/>

The Macdonnell Commission carried out a similar analysis for the same number of years just before the War, and it is instructive to set down their findings. "We have been furnished by the Civil Service Commissioners," states the Report, "with the educational antecedents of the successful competitors for attachéships in the years 1908 to 1913 inclusive. No fewer than 25 out of 37 (about 67 per cent.) came from Eton, while all but a very small fraction had been educated at one or other of the more expensive public schools. In only one case was any university other than Oxford or Cambridge represented." The conclusion is that "no further evidence is required to show the limiting effect of the present regulations upon the class of candidates from which the Diplomatic Corps is recruited."

Some change in the character of the personnel admitted appears to have resulted from the adoption of the new regulations. The percentage coming from Eton has fallen from 67 to 23. But the change is not profound: 65 per cent. in the later period attended one or other of the eleven leading public schools—a percentage which is actually five points higher than the corresponding percentage for the whole period since 1851. Moreover, every entrant, with the exception of one from a preparatory school and another educated at the Royal Naval College, Dartmouth, received a public-school education. Furthermore, as in the six pre-war years, there is only one instance of any university other than Oxford or Cambridge being represented, and this entrant in the later period was also an Oxonian. It is worth noting that while during the whole period studied only about one man in two was university-educated, in the selected post-war years one man alone out of thirty-one did not receive an academic training.

The general inference which follows from a study of the effects of the various reforms in the examination regulations is that they have been substantial but not profound. There has

been a gradual modification of the personnel, but no radical transformation. During the period of patronage nearly three out of four diplomatists were members of the aristocracy or gentry. Since then, democratisation of the conditions of entry has enabled civil servants and professional men increasingly to send their sons into the Foreign Service. The series of reforms has not yet sufficed, however, to make the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service representative of all classes of the community. No trace is discoverable, even since the Macdonnell Commission swept away social distinctions and made diplomacy a career open to talent, of men entering the Foreign Service who have climbed the educational ladder from State elementary school to university. This branch of the British Civil Service is still dominated by the greater public schools and by the older universities. Despite the reforms, environmental advantages still weight the balance heavily in favour of the propertied and the professional classes.

V.

The theory which was first enunciated by Macaulay, and has since 1855 governed entrance to the British Civil Service, is that the examination scheme should be bound up with the general educational system of the country. In the case of the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service, however, the prominence given to foreign languages in the examination has imperilled the full application of the "Macaulay principle." Great advantage in the linguistic section of the examination accrues to candidates who have proceeded straight from school to a foreign pension or tutor. Of the personnel investigated since 1851, almost one-half sat for the examination after having spent their post-school years elsewhere than at a British university.

This defect was recognised by the Macdonnell Commission. "If our proposals are adopted," the Commissioners stated, "the diplomatic service will be made more attractive to men of ability and high academic training, while its members will have greater opportunity of studying subjects of value to them in their profession. Charges have been made before us of defects of knowledge and narrowness of outlook in members of the diplomatic service, and without admitting the justice of such general criticisms, we consider that in many cases there is room for improvement." It appears from the admittedly incomplete evidence obtainable (see Table V) that the remedies they prescribed have had the desired effect. In the years 1923 to 1928 only one non-university-trained candidate was admitted into the Foreign Service.

Failure to profit by the widening of intellectual vision conferred by university life must be a severe handicap to the diplomatist. Once his career opens, he is an exile. Three years at a British university should enable him to appreciate the currents of domestic thought and to evaluate the social forces of his day. If this period of preparation for a diplomatic career is spent abroad, the would-be diplomatist is inevitably cut off from knowledge of the social and political movements of the country which he is destined to represent to foreigners.

The observations of the Macdonnell Report quoted above imply a further criticism of the customary education of candidates for the Foreign Service. Not only is it important that the diplomatist should have acquired a familiarity with what is best in the thought of his own country, but his intellectual equipment should also include a knowledge of economic and political science. It may be true that men who have stayed at a university to the age of 21 or 22 are well equipped for any profession, but this liberal education requires for such a career as diplomacy a supplement of specialised information. Men destined for the fighting services are trained in the art of war-making. Diplomats should have mastered whatever theoretical knowledge may assist them in the art of peace-making.

An inconsiderable fraction of entrants to the Foreign Service take economic and political subjects in the examination, and indeed an idea is current that some bias is accorded by the examiners to those who offer the classics. The fact that so substantial a proportion as 20 per cent. of the more distinguished diplomatists have since 1851 been drawn from the ranks of the Consular Service and of other branches of the Civil Service and from among eminent politicians, together with the additional fact that these laymen have often had careers of outstanding merit, justifies some criticism of the talent available among professional diplomatists. In particular, promotions from a junior service devoted to commercial activities, lend colour to the contention that a knowledge of the economic world, which forms the background of political activity in modern states, should be an integral part of a training for diplomacy. The conduct of foreign relations cannot be properly provided for unless it is recognised that they must be a subject of special study on the part of those responsible for them.

VI.

The unchallengeable conclusion that emerges from this statistical analysis is that the British Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service have been a preserve for the sons of the

aristocratic, rentier and professional classes. For this reason their personnel is not a fair sample of British society as a whole. This was the view of the Macdonnell Commission: "... the Diplomatic Service is effectually closed to all His Majesty's subjects, be they never so well qualified for it, who are not possessed of private means. The official conditions of entry into this Service fix the amount of the private means required at a minimum of £400 a year. The effect is to limit candidature to a narrow circle of society." The bureaucracy in foreign affairs has been one of the last strongholds in which the aristocratic principle has withstood the advance of democracy.

Men who have been nurtured in the British upper class have lived in a world secluded from the common people. Education at a great public school and one of the older universities provides a liberal education that fits men to be good administrators, but it is also a process of initiation into a social caste. Those so reared and trained are imbued with the peculiar prejudices of their walk of life. They are too far removed from the common people to comprehend their point of view. Their perspective is not characteristic of the nation as a whole.

In a democracy the Foreign Service ought firstly to represent to peoples abroad the mental attitude of the nation it stands for, and secondly to convey to the Government at home the mind of foreigners. It is not qualified to perform either of these functions if it is representative only of a very small section of the life of the nation. With the best intentions, it can accurately interpret neither the broad lines of policy laid down by statesmen nor the inclinations of the people they represent. Unless the diplomatic personnel is typical of all classes, it will not work with a constant sense that it is the servant of the whole body politic.

In former times the practice of diplomacy was restricted to Courts and the highest social circles, and this was the reason Bagehot gave as justifying the predominance of the aristocracy in British diplomacy. But to-day aristocratic society is in most countries divorced from government. Familiarity with aristocratic habits is no longer a necessary qualification for the diplomatist. Indeed, the problems that have faced the world since 1919 demand treatment by men with qualities entirely different from those associated with the aristocratic frame of mind. The successful diplomatist needs in this age the capacity to mix with men of all classes and standpoints, a capacity which is not to be acquired from an upbringing in British upper-class society.

Since the Great War there have been in all countries a keener public interest in foreign affairs and a greater popular aspiration towards the maintenance of peace than ever before. In England

these feelings have to a considerable extent found expression in the form of dissatisfaction with the traditional conduct of international relations and with the old assumptions of diplomatic procedure. One general remedy which has attracted widespread support is the closer association of foreign politics with public opinion. The objects of diplomacy, it is argued, should be attuned to those of the people at large. Projects such as the establishment in the House of Commons of a Permanent Foreign Affairs Committee are now advocated as a means to this end. Another way of bringing diplomacy into closer touch with democracy would be to make its personnel a microcosm of the nation as a whole. A Foreign Service containing representatives of all social classes should produce a type of official more sympathetic to public opinion.

Bright's dictum has lost some of its force since it was first enunciated, but the property, if not the purely aristocratic, class is still predominant in the British bureaucracy of foreign affairs. The necessity for widening the field of selection was recognised by the Macdonnell Commission, and since 1919 the Foreign Service has been recruited by merit regardless of class qualifications. Reform of the method of recruitment, however, represents only the first step. As the available evidence indicates, it will not alone produce a genuinely democratic diplomacy. What has next to be done is less obvious, equally necessary, but more difficult. It is so to reconstruct the nation's scholastic system that citizens of all classes are enabled to reach the top rungs of the educational ladder.

Complete emancipation from considerations of social status must, of course, be a slow process. Even when the sons of the lower middle and the working classes gain admission to diplomacy, there is likely to be a bias against their preferment so long as the permanent under-secretaries and the ambassadors of the *ancien régime* remain in control. In the meantime a Foreign Service manned by those drawn from the privileged classes will remain antipathetic to the new internationalist ideals. A democratic diplomacy is alone capable of exploiting the moral forces to-day rallied behind the cause of world peace.

(Reprinted by permission from "The Realist," December, 1929.)

THE FABIAN SOCIETY

11 DARTMOUTH STREET, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.1.

Those willing to join the Labour Party, or desirous of obtaining information about its Programme and Principles, are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the Fabian Society.

The Fabian Society has been, from the outset, a constituent body of the Labour Party; and membership of the Society carries with it full membership of the Labour Party; eligibility for nomination to all Conferences and Offices, and qualification for Labour Party candidatures for Parliament and Local Authorities, without obligation to belong to any other organisation.

The Society welcomes as members any persons, men or women, wherever resident, who subscribe to its Basis (set forth below), and who will co-operate in its work according to their opportunities.

BASIS OF THE FABIAN SOCIETY.

(TO BE SIGNED BY ALL MEMBERS.)

(Adopted May 23rd, 1919.)

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists.

It therefore aims at the reorganisation of Society by the emancipation of Land and Industrial Capital from individual ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land, with equitable consideration of established expectations, and due provision as to the tenure of the home and the homestead; for the transfer to the community, by constitutional methods, of all such industries as can be conducted socially; and for the establishment, as the governing consideration in the regulation of production, distribution and service, of the common good instead of private profit.

The Society is a constituent of the Labour Party and of the International Socialist Congress; but it takes part freely in all constitutional movements, social, economic and political, which can be guided towards its own objects. Its direct business is (a) the propaganda of Socialism in its application to current problems; (b) investigation and discovery in social, industrial, political and economic relations; (c) the working out of Socialist principles in legislation and administrative reconstruction; (d) the publication of the results of its investigations and their practical lessons.

The Society, believing in equal citizenship of men and women in the fullest sense, is open to persons irrespective of sex, race or creed, who commit themselves to its aims and purposes as stated above, and undertake to promote its work.

The Society includes:—

- I. Members, who must sign the Basis and be elected by the Committee. Their Subscriptions are not fixed; each is expected to subscribe annually according to his means. They control the Society through the Executive Committee (elected annually by ballot through a postal vote), and at its annual and other business meetings.
- II. Associates, who sign a form expressing only general sympathy with the objects of the Society and pay not less than 10s. a year. They can attend all except the exclusively members' meetings, but have no control over the Society and its policy.
- III. Subscribers, who must pay at least 5s. a year, and who can attend the Society's Ordinary Lectures.

The monthly paper, *Fabian News*, and the Tracts from time to time published in the well-known Fabian Series, are posted to all these classes. There are convenient Common Rooms, where light refreshments can be obtained, with an extensive library for the free use of members only.

Among the Society's activities (in which it places its services unreservedly at the disposal of the Labour Party and the Local Labour Parties all over the country, the Trade Unions and Trades Councils, and all other Labour and Socialist organisations), may be mentioned:

- (i.) Free lectures by its members and officers;
- (ii.) The well-known Fabian Book-boxes, each containing about three dozen of the best books on Economics, Politics and Social Problems, which can be obtained by any organisation of men or women for 15s. per annum, covering an exchange of books every three months;
- (iii.) Answers to Questions from Members of Local Authorities and others on legal, technical or political matters of Local Government, etc.;
- (iv.) Special subscription courses of lectures on new developments in thought;
- (v.) Economic and social investigation and research, and publication of the results.

Lists of Publications, Annual Report, Form of Application as Member or Associate, and any other information can be obtained on application personally or by letter to the Secretary at the above address.

SELECTION OF FABIAN PUBLICATIONS.

(Complete list sent on application.)

- THE COMMONSENSE OF MUNICIPAL TRADING. By BERNARD SHAW. 1/6 net; postage 2d.
MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS. By R. B. SUTHERS. 1/6 net, postage 2d.
THE DECAY OF CAPITALIST CIVILISATION. By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. Cloth, 4/6; paper, 2/6; postage 4d.
HISTORY OF THE FABIAN SOCIETY. By EDWARD R. PEASE. New edition. 1925. 6/-, postage 5d.
FABIAN ESSAYS. (1920 Edition). 2/6; postage, 3d.
KARL MARX. By HAROLD J. LASKI. 1/-; post free, 1/1½.
TOWARDS SOCIAL DEMOCRACY? By SIDNEY WEBB. 1s. n., post. 1d

FABIAN TRACTS and LEAFLETS.

Tracts, each 16 to 52 pp., price 1d., or 9d. per doz., unless otherwise stated.

Leaflets, 4 pp. each, price 1d. for three copies, 2s. per 100, or 20/- per 1000.

The Set, 10/-; post free 10/9. Bound in buckram, 15/-; post free 15/9.

I—General Socialism in its various aspects.

- TRACTS.—229. National Finance. By F. W. PETHICK-LAWRENCE, M.P. 2d.
216. Socialism and Freedom. By H. J. LASKI, 2d. 200. The State in the New Social Order. By HAROLD J. LASKI. 2d. 180. The Philosophy of Socialism. By A. CLUTTON BROCK. 159. The Necessary Basis of Society. By SIDNEY WEBB. 146. Socialism and Superior Brains. By BERNARD SHAW. 2d. 142. Rent and Value. 107. Socialism for Millionaires. By BERNARD SHAW. 2d. 133. Socialism and Christianity. By Rev. PERCY DEARMER. 2d. 72. The Moral Aspects of Socialism. By SIDNEY BALL 51. Socialism: True and False. By S. WEBB 2d. 45. The Impossibilities of Anarchism. By G. B. SHAW. 2d. 5. Facts for Socialists. Thirteenth Edition, 1926. 6d. 41. The Fabian Society: its Early History. By BERNARD SHAW.

II.—Applications of Socialism to Particular Problems

- TRACTS.—231. The Local Government Act, 1929: How to Make the Best of It. By SIDNEY WEBB. 2d. 230. Imperial Trusteeship. By The Rt. Hon. LORD OLIVIER, K.C., M.G. 2d. 228. Agriculture and the Labour Party. By G. T. GARRATT. 2d. 227. Labour's Foreign Policy. By Mrs. H. M. SWADWICK. 2d. 226. The League of Nations. By BERNARD SHAW. 2d. 223. The British Cabinet: A Study of its Personnel, 1901-1924. By HAROLD J. LASKI. 3d. 220. Seditious Offences. By E. J. C. NEEP. 3d. 196 The Root of Labour Unrest. By SIDNEY WEBB. 2d. 194. Taxes, Rates and Local Income Tax. By ROBERT JONES, D.Sc. 2d. 187. The Teacher in Politics. By SIDNEY WEBB. 2d. 183. The Reform of the House of Lords. By SIDNEY WEBB.

III.—Local Government Powers: How to use them.

- TRACTS.—225. Education Committees: Their Powers and Duties. By H. SAMUELS. 3d. 218. The County Council: What it Is and What it Does. By H. SAMUELS. 190. Metropolitan Borough Councils. By C. R. ATTLEE, M.A. 2d. 191. Borough Councils. By C. R. ATTLEE, M.A. 2d. 189. Urban District Councils. By C. M. LLOYD, M.A. 2d. 62. Parish & District Councils. 2d. 137. Parish Councils & Village Life. 2d.

IV.—On the Co-operative Movement.

202. The Constitutional Problems of a Co-operative Society. By SIDNEY WEBB, M.P. 2d. 203. The Need for Federal Re-organisation of the Co-operative Movement. By SIDNEY WEBB, M.P. 2d. 204. The Position of Employees in the Co-operative Movement. By LILIAN HARRIS. 2d. 205. Co-operative Education. By LILIAN A. DAWSON. 2d. 206. The Co-operator in Politics. By ALFRED BARNES, M.P. 2d.

V—Biographical Series. In portrait covers, 3d.

221. Jeremy Bentham. By VICTOR COHEN. 217. Thomas Paine. By KINGSLEY MARTIN. 215. William Cobbett. By G. D. H. COLE. 199. William Lovett. 1800-1877. By BARBARA HAMMOND. Robert Owen, Idealist. By C. E. M. JOAD. 179. John Ruskin and Social Ethics. By Prof. EDITH MORLEY. 165. Francis Place. By ST. JOHN G. ERVINE. 166. Robert Owen, Social Reformer. By Miss Hutching. 167. William Morris and the Communist Ideal. By Mrs. TOWNSHEND. 168. John Stuart Mill. By JULIUS WEST 174. Charles Kingsley and Christian Socialism. By C. E. VULLIAMY.



HX11 .F25 no.185
Fabian Society, London
Tract

DATE	ISSUED TO
	118075

118075

